



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/467,569	12/20/1999	RAJESH SUNDARAM	6487/54045	2549

7590 09/27/2002

COUDERT BROTHERS
600 BEACH STREET
THIRD FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94109

EXAMINER

SCHNEIDER, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2182

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/467,569

Applicant(s)

SUNDARAM ET AL.

Examiner

Joshua D Schneider

Art Unit

2182

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because the drawings are replete with errors. Some of errors found were the handwritten numbers are often hard to read, numbers are used in reference to more than one object, numbers are not included in the specification with reference to a particular drawing, descriptive numbers are not present in all drawings, numbers and arrows in some drawings are nondescript as to which object they point to, not all prior art is labeled as such, boxes are shaded and not clearly defined, colors are referred to in some black and white drawings, and other errors may be present though not listed here. The applicant is required to thoroughly review the drawings for errors. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The detailed description of drawings section is replete with errors. Examples of these errors include using the same reference numbers while referring to different parts, reference to certain drawings as known that are not labeled as prior art, and referring to numbers not in certain drawings. These and other errors not mentioned are frequent and the applicant is required to review the entire specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant admitted prior art in further view of Kampe et al. (U.S. Patent 5,953,010). With regards to claim 1, the applicant discloses several features of the computer to be common, including the system having a visual display (page 1, line 23), an exterior serial bus port that is very commonly a USB port (page 1, line 21), and an operating system that monitors the USB bus topology and that control access to the USB (page 1, line 28-29). The applicant further discloses that the operating system creates a visual display whenever a USB device is plugged or unplugged (page 3, line 4-6), and that this is accomplished because the operating system has some message handling capabilities (Figure 11 A&B), which distribute messages to the appropriate applications. This includes taking the depiction of the mouse cursor and changing it to an hourglass icon in order to inform the user that the system is busy (page 3, lines 4-6), and then back to the original cursor symbol when the system is again ready for use. The applicant fails to describe the known operating system generating the configuration messages and the descript notification to the user that configuration is in progress and completed. The Kampe et al. reference details the notification of user through a computer resident program that creates displays to update the status of events (column 7, lines 51-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the notification system of Kampe et al. with the applicant

Art Unit: 2182

disclosed prior art, in order to create a system which will notify the user promptly of the progress of a reconfiguration of the USB topology.

5. With regards to claim 2, the applicant admits that it is common in the art to have a computer system that uses message handling to send messages to applications (Figure 11), and that these applications include a mouse controller that creates visual representations of the user movements. The applicant further describes that the messages include changing the appearance of the cursor to indicate that the system is busy and that it is again available for normal use. There is no specific mentioning of the operation of the message handling system, or the state determination unit. The Kampe et al. reference covers these details more specifically and also includes more rigorous discussion of the display and processing. The Kampe et al. reference teaches the hooking and receiving of the messages, and determines what type the message it is (column 7, lines 11-13). With regards to claims 3, 7, 8, 11, 12, and 13, these messages include the beginning, milestone, and completion of event status updates (column 7, lines 55-63), and displays are generated for each of these messages to notify the user of the current status. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, to combine the applicant disclosed prior art with Kampe et al. to create a system and method which notifies the user when a change in the computer topology is detected, a reconfiguration is starting, taking place, and finished, so that changing the number or type of USB devices attached to the computer is less likely to cause a bus crash or system failure.

6. With regards to claim 4, the applicant admits that it is common in the art to use the USB standard port as the serial bus port (page 1, lines 18-19). It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2182

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, to use a USB port with the disclosed system to take advantage of the plug and play features of the USB standard.

7. With regards to claim 5, 9, and 10, the applicant admitted prior art discloses that compound hubs (Figure 4) such as the Fujitsu Universal LAN Hub® (Figure 5) are known, they can be used to replicate the function of a mouse port, a serial port, a printer port, and a keyboard port, and that they can be connected to the computer case through a universal serial bus port via a serial cable. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, to use a compound hub with the combined system of the applicant disclosed prior art and Kampe et al. for the replication of peripheral device ports to reduce the number of connections to the computer case.

8. With regards to claim 6, combined system of the applicant admitted prior art and Kampe et al. fails to teach the inclusion of an audio signal indicative of the status of the configuration. However, it was well known in the art at the time of invention that audio signals are used in conjunction with the operating system and other applications as a method of getting the attention of the user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, to use the combined system of the applicant admitted prior art and Kampe et al. with a speaker and an audio signal indicative of the status of the configuration in order to better alert the user to the configuration process.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Michael et al. (U.S. Patent 5,548,782) discloses a system and method for improving the reliability of a peripheral when it is added or removed. Knight et al. (U.S. Patent 5,787,019)

Art Unit: 2182

discloses a system and method for better handling changes in a peripheral state. McAlear (U.S. Patent 6,389,029) discloses connection and use of the USB standard across a LAN protocol and the benefits and monitoring of the connection there through.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Schneider whose telephone number is (703) 305-7991. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A Gaffin can be reached on (703) 308-3301. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

jds
September 23, 2002


JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100